

Serial No.: 09/622,353

Group Art Unit: 1656

c 1  
9. (Twice Amended) The method of claim 1, further comprising a second amplification to preferentially amplify adapter-modified DNA fragments, wherein said second amplification employs at least two oligonucleotide primers, with one of said primers selectively hybridizing under stringent hybridization conditions to said adapter sequence, and the other primer selectively hybridizing, under stringent hybridization conditions, to said transposable element.

c 2  
17. (Twice Amended) The method of claim 15, further comprising a second amplification to preferentially amplify adapter-modified DNA fragments, wherein said second amplification employs at least two oligonucleotide primers, with one of said primers selectively hybridizing under stringent hybridization conditions to said adapter sequence and the other primer selectively hybridizing under stringent hybridization conditions to said transgene.

#### REMARKS

Claims 1-21 are under examination and pending in the case. Claims 9 and 17 have been amended. Support for the amendments is found in the specification as filed. No new matter has been added. In the previous amendment, Applicants' representative failed to carry forward some of the amendments to claims 9 and 17 in the marked-up version of the claims. In a discussion with Examiner Tung on January 14, 2001, Applicants' representative was instructed to re-amend claims 9 and 17 using the claims in the previous amendment's marked-up version as a starting point.

#### 35 U.S.C. §112, 2<sup>nd</sup> Paragraph

Claims 9 and 17 were rejected under section 112, second paragraph, because it was unclear where the phrase "said preliminary amplification" was referenced. Claims 9 and 17 have been amended to eliminate improper antecedent basis that was the